



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND NOTES

J. DRESCH: *Le Roman Social en Allemagne. 1850-1900.*
Gutzkow, Freytag, Spielhagen, Fontane. (Paris Félix
Alcan 1913) 389 pp.

M. Dresch's work is not a series of monographs but a well-organized work of the highest unity. The writer addresses himself primarily to his countrymen, seeking to make the four authors better understood by the French public at large. This is shown by the fact that the numerous and long quotations from the novelists treated invariably appear in the text in French translations.

The critic's impelling interests were social and political quite as much as literary. He defines with the utmost precision how Gutzkow, Freytag, Spielhagen and Fontane looked upon the revolution of 1848 and upon the war of 1870 with the events that preceded and followed it. He specifies the views of all four in regard to German unity, Prussian hegemony, to the "Junker", the middle class and the fourth estate, and gives a well-founded estimate of the reliability of all as historical witnesses. If followed with due caution M. Dresch's work will prove an invaluable guide to the novels of Gutzkow, Freytag, Spielhagen and Fontane for it interprets their novels in the light of their entire published works, their private letters and memoirs, their critical writings in regard to previous and contemporary literary models and regarding each other. The criticisms of the last named order are among the most instructive.

M. Dresch does not believe that "Tendenz" can be excluded from novels or from criticism and makes for himself no hypocritical claims to impartiality. In order rightly to make use of this excellent work it is important to ascertain just wherein this self-confessed "Tendenz" lies.

M. Dresch's personal bias exhibits itself most clearly in his treatment of Freytag. It must be admitted that in method and style his personal portrait of Freytag is a masterpiece not inferior to the work of a Thackeray. With ostensible impassionateness, with cool synthesis he combines out of Freytag's own words a startling confession of narrowness of mind, of prejudice and of self-satisfaction. He concedes at the outset that Freytag has an ideal and a patriotic one. Freytag wrote to Treitschke in 1863: "We are of those who live a little for themselves, a little for their friends and chiefly for their people."¹ It was Freytag's desire to contribute to

¹ *Gustav Freytag u. H. v. Treitschke im Briefwechsel* S. 5.

the national welfare by supporting the national ideal. Now according to Freytag the typical German was anti-Austrian, that is pro-Prussian. He was furthermore Protestant. Protestant and Prussian were nearly synonymous to his mind. Thirdly, the sound core of German life was the middle class. Freytag describes himself at the beginning of his "Erinnerungen" as Prussian, Protestant and belonging to the middle class and shows thus that he feels himself to be a German of the Germans. M. Dresch frequently returns to this point. For example, after surprising us with a laudatory description of the König family in the last volume of the "Ahnenn" series, M. Dresch adroitly reminds us that Freytag was himself the model for Victor König. He remarks: "Cette longue série de romans aboutit à la famille de Freytag, à Freytag lui-même, qui aurait pu leur donner pour titre—*Mes Ancêtres*. En somme n'est il pas l'héritier de toutes les vertus germaniques?"² Dresch adds another trait to this picture of Freytag. That is tranquil joy. Real joy according to Freytag consists rather in the contemplation of the achieved than in anticipations of the future. This is true of the individual and of the community. Freytag's novels end leaving no doubt as to the tranquil happiness of the good characters and expressing no dissatisfaction with society as it exists. Freytag himself looked upon his own life work with a feeling of satisfaction. The course of his life had been marked by few failures. Throughout all his career he was popular with the people, praised by the predominant literary criticism and in accord with the prevailing political development, the rise of the power of Prussia. It is not strange that he formed the high opinion of his literary achievement which he expresses in a letter written to the Duke of Coburg, April 11, 1874, and cited by M. Dresch:³ "Wie auch das Masz meiner Kraft sein mag, unter den lebenden Künstlern unseres Volkes erkenne ich keinen über mir, nicht viele als meinesgleichen".

M. Dresch's bias is equally marked in his concession to Freytag of two good qualities—honesty and simplicity. Freytag's civic honesty was shown, M. Dresch says, by his abhorrence of the idea of demanding an indemnity from France after the war of 1870-71. His civic simplicity was shown by his opposition to the assumption of imperial dignity on the part of the Prussian king. We find M. Dresch elsewhere taking the side of Freytag, wherever Freytag assumes an attitude of opposition to Bismarck.

² Dresch p. 160.

³ Dresch p. 170.

M. Dresch appraises low the value of Freytag's novels as historical documents. Freytag does not even present, he says, a complete picture of the middle class. The chief joy of the middle class, domestic happiness, is absent. Furthermore his picture is one-sided in that it concedes none of the foibles of the middle class. Stout citizen though he was, Hans Sachs knew the weaknesses of his class, its narrowness, self-satisfaction and self-interest. These qualities escaped Freytag's notice completely. M. Dresch chiefly discredits Freytag's pictures of contemporary society, however, because the laboring class is omitted from them. Freytag asserted, it is well known, that the novel should be without "Tendenz". His idea of "Tendenz" apparently was dissatisfaction with the present, agitation for reforms in the future. To exclude from his novels the fermentation of unrest he excluded the laboring class and emphasized the agreeable side of the social organization of the recent past, in which the middle class had come to its heritage. M. Dresch asks pointedly whether this is absence of "Tendenz."

M. Dresch's strictures upon Freytag are by no means new. Kummer in his *Deutsche Literaturgeschichte d. 19. Jahrhunderts* mentions most of the points referred to by M. Dresch. The Frenchman's characterization is, however, the most realistic and convincing that has yet appeared and it will certainly leave its impress upon literary history. But however correct it may be in its essentials it is certainly open to criticism in some respects.

In the first place it is not correct to assume that Freytag believed that he had attained at least in *Soll und Haben* his ideal of freedom from "Tendenz". In a letter written to Geffken on the twenty-third of August 1856 he confesses: "Wenn das Publikum wohlwollend über die Unterhaltungsfähigkeit des Buches urteilt, so ist mir das schon recht, aber im Grunde lag mir während der Arbeit am meisten an der Tendenz und zwar an der politischen. Das mag für diese und künftige Kunstleistungen ein Übelstand sein, aber gern will ich auf den Dichterruhm verzichten, welcher nur durch eine vollständige Freiheit gegenüber den Erscheinungen des wirklichen Lebens erworben werden kann. Überall fühle ich mich in einem stillen Eifer, den ich am liebsten einen preussischen nennen möchte."⁴

Then M. Dresch disregards too much the transitions in Freytag's development. Such a method necessarily leads to unsympathetic treatment. He minimizes Freytag's Young

⁴ *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Literaturgeschichte*. Neue Folge Bd. 13 (1889) S. 88-91.

German tendencies before the year 1848. This paves the way for a total disregard of the influence of the *Grenzboten* on the new Freytag of the post-revolutionary period. Critics have often seen in Fink in *Soll und Haben* the type of a Young German becoming "solid"⁵ and have found in him much of Freytag himself. Strange that no critic has yet seen traits of Julian Schmidt in Fink's matter of fact co-worker, Anton. The two characters mutually influenced each other in much the same way as the two *Grenzboten* editors. The fact that the occupation of the father of both Anton and Julian Schmidt was similar may be more than a coincidence.⁶ By giving more attention to the personal influences upon Freytag M. Dresch might have presented him in a less unfavorable light.

In the third place M. Dresch emphasizes too much Freytag's spirit of social caste as the reason for his exclusion of the laboring class from his novel. Freytag did not lack sympathy with the laboring classes. M. Dresch himself concedes this at one point though he denies it elsewhere.⁷ The real reason, he says, manifests itself systematically in all his works. "Freytag s'est refusé à introduire la démocratie dans son roman parcequ'il trouvait en elle trop de laideurs et trop de confuses aspirations".⁸ "Il ne veut pas tourner son attention vers un avenir incertain; il tient à s'arrêter au passé immédiat C'est une activité 'reposée' qu'il s'attache à retracer, et non pas les débuts d'un industrialisme qu'il sent déjà fiévreux."⁹ On the contrary the real reason for Freytag's omission of the fourth estate is one which M. Dresch here minimizes. Freytag followed, namely, the safe principle of writing from actual experience, not from superficial observation. He had had personal contact with the

⁵ Robert Prutz first characterized Fink as a "solid gewordener Saalfeld" (see Prutz, *Die deutsche Literatur der Gegenwart*, 1859 S. 106. Saalfeld was the hero of Freytag's early play *Die Valentine*. Prutz was perhaps the first to recognize Freytag's close affinity with the Young German movement. See an article by him in the *Deutsches Museum*, 1858 II, pp. 441-458. In fairness of judgment and aptness of characterization this article has not been surpassed by later criticisms. Gustav Freytag's Young German tendencies have recently been systematically treated by O. Mayrhofer, *Gustav Freytag und das Junge Deutschland*. Marburger Dissertation 1907.

⁶ Anton's father (see Freytag's *Gesammelte Werke* IV S. 5) was "königlicher Calculator" and Julian Schmidt's father (see *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* XXXI p. 751) occupied a similar position. The relation of Julian Schmidt to Anton is treated at some length in an investigation of mine soon to be published.

⁷ Dresch p. 110 and p. 164.

⁸ Dresch p. 112.

⁹ Dresch p. 108.

circles of society represented in *Soll und Haben* and *Die verlorene Handschrift*. He had associated with merchants, aristocrats, peasant proprietors and university professors. The laboring class, however, he did not thoroughly understand. To draw a picture of the laboring class without intimate knowledge thereof, to emphasize the elements of discontent without having a definite and practical program of betterment was to Freytag a profitless procedure. Gutzkow had, to his mind, already proved this. Such opinions as these are definitely expressed by Freytag in an article which he contributed to the *Grenzboten* in 1853.¹⁰ Appearing thus at the time when Freytag was beginning his *Soll und Haben* the article may be justly regarded as the advance program of his novel. It was not included in his *Vermischte Aufsätze* (1903), in his *Gesammelte Aufsätze* (1888) nor in his *Gesammelte Werke* (1886-1888) and probably for this reason has escaped the attention of M. Dresch as well as of Freytag's previous critics and biographers. In this article Freytag declares that not the dilettante hero but the man at work should be the subject of the German novel; German life as it is is full of interesting and romantic realities. Trade and industry he suggests as proper backgrounds for the German novel. These opportunities have been neglected by the novelists hitherto and he asks why. "Die Antwort darauf ist leider, weil unsere Romanschriftsteller in der Mehrzahl sehr wenig, ja zuweilen so gut wie gar nichts von dem Treiben der Gegenwart verstehen."¹¹ Freytag commends them to the course of J. Gotthelf and above all of Walter Scott. First let them intimately know their social subject matter, then let them discuss it.

There is no better illustration of Freytag's early democratic tendencies than his fragment of 1884, *Der Gelehrte*.¹² In this work the title hero, who is in many respects Freytag himself, refuses a political career in the conservative ministry and refuses the editorship of a liberal paper, believing that neither party has solved the social problem. He determines to enter the ranks of the laboring class and learn from his

¹⁰ *Grenzboten* 1853 I, 77-80. It was, however, recognized by Freytag as his own. See *Vermischte Aufsätze* II, S. 432.

¹¹ *Grenzboten* 1853 I, S. 78. We hear furthermore in these works an echo of Julian Schmidt's *Grenzboten* criticism. Through the pages of this journal between the years 1848 and 1853 we find the constant recommendation that the dilettante hero of the Wilhelm Meister type be supplanted by the hero of the life-long realistic occupation as in the English novel. This is what Freytag has attempted in *Soll und Haben* and we may say that it is the chief respect in which Freytag is more modern than Gutzkow.

¹² *Gesammelte Werke* Bd. II. S. 132.

fellows. With the words: "Ich gehe in das Volk" the dramatic fragment ends. "Das Volk" means here not the fourth estate, it is true, but rather the lower middle class, nevertheless Freytag shows in these words a quite notable freedom from prejudice. Gutzkow and the Young German writers were willing to instruct the working classes but not to learn from them. The abrupt close of the fragment with these words shows at once the willingness and the inability of Freytag to depict the social and political aspirations of the laboring class.

That Freytag in his novel *Soll und Haben* should have painted a picture of society and should have omitted to indicate the conflict between labor and capital as a main element seems to us now remarkable. But Germany was not so far advanced economically in 1850 as England and France. To the Germans it may well have appeared as if the question of the justification of an aristocratic class were the more important social problem. M. Dresch seems hardly to take these facts into consideration and passes judgment on the matter from the point of view of a Frenchman of today.

The economic Germany of 1870 was, it is true, much like the economic Europe of today. One might properly have expected Freytag to conclude his "Ahnen" series with a picture of modern economic life. There is no good reason for doubting the report of Freytag's wife, that he recognized it as incumbent upon him to do so.¹³ That he did not publish such a work, however, is explicable. He was interested in the modern problems of labor but had not made the close acquaintance of the industrial laborer. He was too far advanced in years to learn fully and to comprehend the laborer's point of view. He was but following the principles of his entire literary career when he refrained from picturing a phase of life with which he was unfamiliar.

For many decades the unfavorable judgment of Julian Schmidt and of Treitschke was adopted in regard to Gutzkow. Political events seemed to sanction their views and the extensiveness of Gutzkow's work discouraged independent investigation. The growing interest in the fourth estate and in naturalism has reawakened an interest in this once despised forerunner of the modern movement, and time has mitigated certain political controversies and permitted a milder judgment of him. Except in the person of his confessed advocates Gutzkow has rarely found a better defender than M. Dresch.

The political and literary opposition between Freytag and Gutzkow is well known. The opposition of their social ideas

¹³ See Ulrich G. Freytags *Romantechnik*, S. 27.

was no less pronounced. Freytag put his trust in the dominance of the middle class. Gutzkow stood for a leveling movement, which should do away with all class distinctions. The state should exist in order to protect labor. M. Dresch regards "Die Ritter vom Geist" as a social rather than a political work. In this novel Gutzkow represents the failure of statesmen of diverse parties but finds the hope of the future in a voluntary association of public-spirited men who agree to cast aside social differences and thus set an example of how the citizen may work for the public good.

"Der Zauberer von Rom" was born out of Gutzkow's hope for a Germany united religiously as well as politically, out of his hope, indeed, for a world-unity of religion. In religious dogma he found no hindrance to this hope. He believed if the papacy could be deprived of its temporal dominions this ideal could be realized. History has proved Gutzkow to be in the wrong but M. Dresch says: "La portée sociale n'en est point par là diminuée. Pour être le romancier de son temps, il faut en traduire aussi les pensées chimériques."¹⁴ One cannot but approve of this tolerant criticism, but why should not the author have made a similar concession to the prejudices of Freytag in his *Soll und Haben*.

M. Dresch accepts Gutzkow's novel *Die neuen Serapionsbrüder* (1877) as a true picture of the general feeling of unrest, insecurity and discontent that prevailed in Germany after the war of 70-71 with France. In this work Gutzkow manifests his disgust at the hollow, materialistic results obtained by the war.

M. Dresch lays emphasis rather upon the differences than upon the similarities between Gutzkow and his French models. If he adopted the intricate mechanism of mystery of Eugene Sue, it was in order to carry the interest of the reader through long political discussions. He believed with Balzac in the important rôle that materialistic considerations play in life, yet he often attributed benevolent motives to his characters. A higher sense of unity led him to compose a "*Roman des Nebeneinanders*" rather than a "*Comédie humaine*." *Wilhelm Meister* was the novel that Gutzkow really took as his model. The combination of eighteenth century idealism with nineteenth century social interest in all classes appealed to him. The slow cumbersome movement, the humanitarian and didactic intent are common to both novels. In both symbolic and typical characters exist side by side with realistic ones. M. Dresch interprets a leading character, Hackert in the "Ritter vom Geist," as a symbol of democracy,¹⁵ and

¹⁴ Dresch p. 66.

¹⁵ Dresch p. 42.

thus takes issue apparently unconsciously with Julian Schmidt, whose matter of fact mind protested against such an interpretation in a realistic work,¹⁶ and who declared that the moral code of Hackert was in no sense representative of the time.¹⁷

It is to be regretted that M. Dresch did not join issue directly with some of the earlier critics in regard to Gutzkow's historical reliability. He admits that public characters and events are slightly distorted. This was due to the political condition of the time. Serious treatment of contemporary social and political affairs was forbidden, hence these subterfuges on Gutzkow's part. Except for this inconsiderable reservation M. Dresch's claims in regard to Gutzkow are extreme. He characterizes Gutzkow as a "peintre exact et fidèle des choses de son temps."¹⁸ A new and more favorable estimate of Gutzkow, if it is true, gaining ground but even so generally favorable a critic as R. M. Meyer finds it hard to believe that Gutzkow's novels present a true picture¹⁹ while Gutzkow's contemporary, Julian Schmidt said: "Dasz Gutzkow ein Portrait der Zeit, wie seine Verehrer behaupten, nicht geliefert hat, wird der Unbefangene wohl von selbst erkennen."²⁰ The general tendency on the part of recent critics to do justice to the lost political cause of Young Germany is to be commended, but it would be disastrous if it should lead them to overestimate the historical reliability of the Young German novels.

M. Dresch's treatment of Freytag and of Gutzkow serves to show with what reservations his opinions need be accepted. It should be added that his judgments in regard to Spielhagen and Fontane have been less affected by social bias. It is easy for M. Dresch to be fair to both, for both sympathised with the strivings of the fourth estate, and both were aristocratic in their tastes, even though Spielhagen often attacked the nobility bitterly. M. Dresch finds a high merit in Spielhagen's attempt to reconcile naturalism and classicism, theoretically in his "Neue Beiträge zur Theorie und Technik der Epik und Dramatik" and practically in his last novels. He rejoices that Spielhagen's novels are regaining some of the popularity lost in the last decade of the nineteenth century.

¹⁶ J. Schmidt *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* 2te Auflage Bd. I, S. 91.

¹⁷ J. Schmidt *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* 2te Auflage Bd. III, S. 301.

¹⁸ Dresch p. 20.

¹⁹ Meyer *Deutsche Literatur im 19. Jht.* III Aufl. S. 227.

²⁰ Schmidt *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur.* 2te. Aufl. Bd. III. S. 311.

He regards Spielhagen's novels as valuable contributions to our knowledge of the times described, but agrees with Schian²¹ and with Bleibtreu²² that Gutzkow described more exactly the conditions and events of his period.

Fontane wins the favor of M. Dresch completely by the novels of his last years, wherein he holds up to view the narrowness of mind, the coldness, the purely formal morality of the self-satisfied middle class, thus emphasizing the features that Freytag had neglected in his picture and performing the function of a German Flaubert or Balzac. Fontane began to form his impressions of the Berlin middle-class citizen in 1866, while serving as an apprentice to a pharmacist. He was able to declare in 1898 that the average present day citizen possessed less false virtue and more real virtue than the citizen of sixty years ago.²³

Perhaps it is due to a sympathy born of the kinship of race that M. Dresch's account of Fontane is the product of more enthusiasm and more industry than his account of Spielhagen. To reconcile Spielhagen's novelistic theory with his practice is not a task demanding originality. Spielhagen himself has done that thoroughly and will long remain the chief of Spielhagen authorities. Fontane's theory must, however, be carefully collated out of personal correspondence, daily dramatic criticism, reported conversations and memoirs. For performing this task M. Dresch will deserve the gratitude of later critics of Fontane. He has also accounted for the literary development of Fontane, explaining his transitions from revolutionary lyrics to old Prussian ballads, from travel correspondence to history, from the historical novel to the contemporary social novel in such a way as to make Fontane's literary career seem logical and consistent.

In some instances M. Dresch's judgments in regard to Fontane reveal his partiality a little too strongly. He cannot avoid the question, why Fontane with all his interest in the fourth estate never caused it to play a part in his novels. The answer he gives is: "Son âge avancé ne lui permettait guère d'aller étudier de près la vie de l'ouvrier."²⁴ In other words Fontane did not describe the fourth estate because he did not know it intimately. The explanation is simple and fair, but why could not it have been made in behalf of Freytag as well?

M. Dresch's nationalistic bias appears most strikingly in

²¹ Schian *Der Deutsche Roman seit Goethe*. (1904). S. 86.

²² Bleibtreu *Revolution der Literatur*. (Leipzig 1886) S. 28.

²³ *Von Zwanzig bis Dreissig*, S. 12.

²⁴ Dresch p. 360.

his opposition to Bismarck. He takes no little satisfaction in pointing out that all four novelists, diverse as were their political and social opinions in other respects, were united in their discontent with the social conditions following the year 1870 and were unanimous in holding Bismarck responsible for the conditions which they condemned. In the case of three of the novelists this opposition is sufficiently well-known. Fontane, however, has usually been presented as a whole-souled admirer of Bismarck.

Fontane, M. Dresch says, always felt a strong admiration for the "Junker". Bismarck, at the beginning of his career, gave promise of becoming such a hero as Fontane's imagination loved to paint. Fontane could with difficulty reconcile himself to the later disappointments which Bismarck had in store for him. Thereafter there existed for Fontane two Bismarcks—his ideal Bismarck, whom he often permitted himself to celebrate in verse, and another Bismarck, whom he criticised unsparingly in his private letters. The attitude of Fontane to Bismarck is worthy of a special investigation, undertaken perhaps preferably not by a Frenchman. At any rate M. Dresch has performed a good service in emphasizing the fact that Fontane's admiration for Bismarck was not unmixed. He has, moreover, taken account of the laudatory lyrics, while such biographers as Servaes²⁵ and Ettlinger²⁶ have disregarded the condemnatory private letters.

In conclusion M. Dresch points out that all four of these novelists desired German unity, however different their ideals in regard to this united Germany. An earnest purpose led all to the novel. All sought in their own way to assist in the realization of their ideal. "Gutzkow a vu dans le roman le meilleur moyen d'initier une nation aux questions vitales dont dépend sa destinée. Freytag a tenté de faire l'éducation patriotique du peuple allemand. Spielhagen a mis dans ses livres tout l'idéalisme du XVIIIe siècle et sa conception si noble de l'humanité. Fontane a voulu que la société moderne, en se regardant vivre dans le roman, éprouvât le désir d'être moins vaine et plus sincère."²⁷ All four, however, presented incomplete pictures, "même Gutzkow et Spielhagen qui ont visé à la 'totalité.' Gutzkow manque d'art; il est si touffu que l'on a peine à voir clair dans une telle surabondance. Freytag ne comprend la solidarité sociale qu'en Prussien

²⁵ Servaes, Franz: *Th. Fontane* Berlin 1900. (Die Dichtung herausgegeben von Paul Remer.)

²⁶ Ettlinger, Josef: *Theodor Fontane* Berlin (Die Literatur herausgegeben von Georg Brandes).

²⁷ Dresch p. 388.

bourgeois et protestant. Spielhagen la marque plus largement, mais d'une façon abstraite. Fontane la voit psychologiquement, intimement, mais fragmentairement."²⁸ It would have required a Shakespeare to represent this era in its totality, M. Dresch says, and Germany has had no such Shakespeare. None of the four novelists could even be compared with Balzac or with Tolstoi.²⁸

M. Dresch's work is full of such enlightening comparisons as those just quoted. It presents in a systematic form a modern and thoroughly independent estimate of the authors. His judgments in regard to Spielhagen and Fontane are as securely grounded and as nearly non-partisan as any that had hitherto appeared.²⁹ All four portions are based on the intensity of study required for a monograph, but monographic partiality is noticeable only in the case of Gutzkow,³⁰ and if the critic's judgment of Freytag is too severe to be final it is too well supported to be disregarded.

L. M. PRICE.

University of Missouri.

GÜNTHER JACOBY: HERDER ALS FAUST—Felix Meiner. Leipzig 1911.

"Herder als Faust." Es liegt ein zum Widerspruche aufreizendes Moment in diesem Titel. Man hat das Gefühl, als gelte es ein Attentat auf Goethes Genius. Ich gestehe, das Buch zur Hand genommen zu haben, erfüllt von solchem Geiste des Widerspruchs. Allein ich gestehe auch, es aus der Hand gelegt zu haben im Gefühle, dass es mir möglich gewesen ist, den Verfasser auf jedem seiner Schritte verständnisvoll zu begleiten, wenn ich mich auch nicht in der Lage finde, von ihm hinsichtlich des wesentlichsten Punktes rückhaltslos überzeugt worden zu sein. Dieser wesentlichste Punkt ist die Behauptung, dass die Faustgestalt vom Anfange des ersten Teils der Tragödie bis zur Schwelle von Auerbachs Keller die Gestalt Herders ist, wie sie sich in Goethes Phantasie projizierte. Ist diese Behauptung tatsäch-

²⁸ Dresch p. 387.

²⁹ Almost simultaneously with M. Dresch's work appeared the monograph of Dr. Victor Klemperer *Die Zeitromane Friedrich Spielhagens und ihre Wurzeln* 179 Seiten (Weimar 1913) in *Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte*, no. XLIII. This will supplement the French work with its different points of view and different comparisons. The work is as scholarly and perhaps more unbiased than M. Dresch's work but its intricate style will cause it to be less used.

³⁰ M. Dresch is also the author of a monograph *Gutzkow et la jeune Allemagne* Paris Cornely et Cie.